DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 585 EC 051 237

AUTHOR	Nazzaro, Jean
TITLE	Second Dimension: Special Education Administrators View the Field.
INSTITUTION	Council for Exceptional Children, Arlington, Va. Information Center on Exceptional Children.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 73
NOTE	19p.; Imprint, One of a Series of Special Interest Papers from the CEC Information Center
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Problems; Administrator Attitudes; *Exceptional Child Research; *Handicapped Children; Interviews; *National Surveys; Special Education Teachers; *Supervisors

ABSTRACT

Reported were the results of a telephone interview survey of all the state directors of special education, the director of special education of the District of Columbia, and 40 administrators of local districts which considered topics such as current problems and issues, outstanding programs, personnel training, identification and diagnosis of children, and program evaluation. Seen as the most controversial issue was mainstreaming and the labeling or categorizing the disabilities. Effectiveness of programs was the area most frequently given to be of highest research priority. Finding well trained, competent staff was reported to be the most difficult problem of special education administrators. Approximately half of the state directors reported 50% or more of their exceptional children currently being served while six state directors thought that less than 25% were being served. Thirty-five state directors cited emotionally disturbed children as being the most difficult for which to program. (DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 073585

Imprint

One in a series of special interest papers from the CEC Information Center

EC 051 237 E

ED 073585

Imprint

One in a series of special interest papers from the CEC Information Center

Second Dimension
Special Education Administrators View the Field

Jean Nazzaro, Program Associate
CEC Information Center

Publication Date: January, 1973

A product of the CEC Information Center (CEC ERIC Clearinghouse), The Council for Exceptional Children, Jefferson Plaza, Suite 900, 1411 South Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202.

The work presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, US Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the US Office of Education and no official endorsement by the US Office of Education should be inferred.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Second Dimension: Special Education Administrators View the Field

Jean Nazzaro

During the fall and winter of the 1971-72 school year, the CEC Information Center conducted telephone interviews with all the state directors of special education and a sample of administrators from 40 local districts. In rather informal conversations, the directors talked about special education services in their states and districts, current problems and issues they faced as administrators, outstanding programs, the status of personnel training, identification and diagnosis of children, and program evaluation. These interviews were primarily designed to survey the needs of special educators and provide information for product development. Many of the conversations ended with a request for feedback on the project, therefore this special interest paper has been prepared.

The text is primarily composed of the verbatim responses of the administrators with appropriate editing to preserve the anonymity of the speaker.

A brief look at the responses to selected questions is of interest in understanding how topics were chosen for the report.

Administrators were asked what they saw as the hottest controversy or issue in special education today. The overwhelming response was the issue of mainstreaming and the related controversy over labeling or categorizing disabilities. Twenty-eight state directors and 24 local directors cited this as the major controversy. Table 1 summarizes the hottest issues as seen by state directors and local administrators from small (enrollment under 5,000), medium (enrollment 5,000-25,000) and large (enrollment over 25,000) school districts.

Mainstreaming - labeling includes the concept of placing exceptional children into regular classes for at least part of the school day with some support from a resource teacher and the dropping of descriptive labels.

Proper evaluation and programing refers to testing for strengths and weaknesses and describing appropriate curriculum and methodology for optimum learning. Also included in this category is the misplacement of minority group children.

Legislation refers to the ever increasing demand for more services as mandated by state legislatures.

Funding covers the problems of obtaining and distributing monies.

TABLE 1

Frequency of Controversial Issues in Special Education Reported by State and Local Administrators

Issue	*State Director*	*Local Directors*		
		Small (n=8)	*Medium (n=21)*	*Large (n=11)*
Mainstreaming or Labeling	28	2	16	5
Proper evaluation and Programing	13	0	1	4
Legislation	7	0	1	1
Funding	4	1	3	1

TABLE 2

Frequency of Research Priorities in Special Education
Reported by State and Local Administrators

Priority	*State Director*	*Local Directors*		
		Small (n=8)	*Medium (n=21)*	*Large (n=11)*
Effectiveness of programs	23	3	8	1
Diagnosis and Programing	10	2	4	3
Teacher training and Competency	8	0	3	0
Increasing alternatives	5	1	3	3
Early childhood programs	3	0	3	0

Each director was asked what he saw as the research priorities for special education in the 70's. Table 2 indicates the areas of greatest interest for state and local districts.

Effectiveness of programs combines the problems of accountability for present programs and an interest in determining what alternative is most effective, i.e. mainstreaming, resource room, self-contained, etc.

Diagnosis and programing reflects a concern for better methods of determining children's needs and prescribing appropriate programs.

Teacher training and competency involve the investigation of traits and skills needed for effective teaching.

Increasing alternatives show a recognition of a need for additional models for delivery systems.

Early childhood programs include the need to determine the effectiveness of early diagnosis and preschool programing.

Administrators were asked to identify the most difficult problem or challenge currently facing them as state administrators. The five areas of concern were

1. Finding well trained competent teachers and staff capable of taking a leadership role as professional educators.
2. Funding.
3. Program delivery—making the best use of resources and serving children in rural areas and small districts.
4. Communication—getting public and general educational support.
5. Legislative problems—including the need for new legislation as well as problems in complying with new mandates.

Each state director was asked to describe the general picture of special education in his state. Approximately half of the states reported that 50 percent or more of all their exceptional children are currently being served in some program. Thirteen states reported between 25 and 50 percent served and six states thought that less than 25 percent were being provided for.

The five strongest programs in decreasing order were programs for the educable mentally retarded, trainable mentally retarded, hard of hearing, visually impaired, and speech handicapped.

Thirty-five directors cited emotionally disturbed children as those most difficult to program for. Twenty-two named learning disabilities as a second problem area. Programs for the deaf and hard of hearing were difficult areas for one quarter of the states. Service for the multiply handicapped was also considered a problem.

Local directors were also asked to describe the services and programs for exceptional children in their district. Table 3 summarizes the percentage of districts surveyed that are providing some program in specific areas of exceptionality.

TABLE 3

Percent of Local Districts Providing Programs by Area of Exceptionality

Exceptionality	*District*		
	Small (n=8) less than 5,000 students	*Medium (n=21) 5,000 to 25,000 students*	*Large (n=11) more than 25,000 students*
Educable Mentally Retarded	87.5%	100%	100%
Trainable Mentally Retarded	62.5	100	82
Hearing Impaired	50	76	100
Visually Impaired	25	52	82
Speech Impaired	50	95	91
Orthopedically Handicapped	25	54	82
Learning Disabled	25	81	82
Emotionally Disturbed	0	48	73
Gifted	25	28.5	45

The CEC Information Center's project surveying the field of special education through the perspective of state and local directors followed on the heels of a similar survey done with researchers in special education during 1970.

A special interest publication entitled *Dimensions* summarized the interests and concerns of researchers in special education. One chapter brought together problems in exceptional child research which included behavior modification, early childhood education, strategies for special education, innovations in personnel training and curriculum development. A comparison of the two surveys shows areas of convergent interest.

Topics included under the heading of behavior modification were behavioral objectives, precision teaching, prescriptive teaching, diagnostic teaching, engineered classroom and contingency management. These concepts were also present in the state directors' responses; however, they were more directed toward applied strategies. For example, under management of the emotionally disturbed was the concept of behavior modification and the engineered classroom. The area of behavioral objectives seemed to be more related to the concept of accountability for the state directors in that it had applications beyond behavior modification as a research technique.

In the area of early childhood education, state directors were generally concerned about diagnosis, parent training, and early identification.

Strategies for special education included special class versus regular class placement, labeling, mainstreaming, the learning disabilities movement, resource teachers, behavioral classification, individualized instruction, and institutional placement. Mainstreaming or dropping labels seemed to be the most controversial issue for the state administrators. The use of resource teachers and other personnel in facilitating regular class placement with support was accepted as a general strategy by the state people.

Innovations in personnel training included micro teaching, mini courses, remedial diagnosis, simulation games, interdisciplinary training, and short-term inservice. Of these innovations, micro teaching was mentioned by one state director. Remedial diagnosis such as the Diagnostic Prescriptive Teaching was mentioned several times. Interdisciplinary training seemed to be a movement supported by many state directors for both special educators and regular classroom teachers.

The area of curriculum development included specific programs in the fields of social studies, arithmetic and reading, language and early reading, and science by the researchers. Of these, the science project developed in Colorado for the mentally retarded was the only one mentioned by a state director.

In the area of current controversies, regular class placement versus special class placement included the evaluation of special education students, expectancies of teachers, labels and new alternatives, or range of intervention strategies. This controversy, seen as the number one controversy by researchers, was also cited as the number one controversy by state directors. The nature-

nurture controversy including the disadvantaged and the mentally deficient were of far less concern to the state directors than to the research people. One state director felt that learning disabilities would be the new catch-all program for behavioral and learning problems just as the EMR program has been in the past.

The area of single method teacher training versus several method teacher training, and one handicap training versus multidiscipline training was quite important to the state directors and many of them were moving toward a multiskilled special educator, as well as a staff of regular teachers with broader educational experiences with exceptional children. Manualism versus oralism in educating the deaf seemed to be important to many state directors.

The concerns, interests, and needs of special educators emerged rather clearly from the interviews. Most administrators agreed that the controversy over mainstreaming is the biggest issue in the field today. The topic lends itself well to ideological polarization and strong arguments exist on both sides, but many educators feel that a categorical position at either extreme overlooks the needs of the individual child.

What is really missing is a means for evaluating existing programs, and some way to determine the best alternative for each child. This, in fact, was seen as the most important research priority for the 70's.

Assuming the technical skills of program evaluation can be developed and an appropriate match can be made between program and learner, the final process will only be as good as the people who implement it. Finding well trained competent teachers and staff was considered the most difficult challenge facing state administrators.

Selecting the best teaching strategy for children who show consistent academic growth and social behavior is difficult in itself, but programing for learners who exhibit unpredictable behavior or uneven academic advancement has been overwhelming. These youngsters, identified as emotionally disturbed and learning disabled, were cited as most difficult to provide for.

These four issues, Mainstreaming, Program Evaluation, Professional Competence, and Programing for the Emotionally Disturbed and Learning Disabled, have been selected as the areas of greatest interest to today's leaders in special education.

MAINSTREAMING

The major controversy in special education today involves labeling handicapped children and the related problem of where to place them. Among the state administrators, at least 28 pinpointed the problem of labeling, or regular class versus special class as one of their major concerns. Twenty-three of the local special education administrators also found this to be a major problem.

Concerns felt by state administrators over the concept of mainstreaming or placing children of varying exceptionalities in regular classes and eliminating all labeling are best expressed by their verbatim comments.

"In my judgment, to drop labels entirely is to give up categorical legislative aid for the handicapped, which will destroy your possibilities for having educational intervention for them. You cannot give up the categories, although you may find ways of funding the categories so you have more flexibility. But the minute you give up the categories, the legislature will dump you right back into general education. The legislator does not understand something that does not have the word 'handicapped' on it. And I think the attempt to give up categories is naive and premature. It's usually promoted by people who don't have to deal with political reality."

"Part of my concern is that we as special educators must realize that while we are saying 'keep handicapped children in the regular classroom' we must make a tremendous effort to convince the general educators—the teachers and administrators—of this. I am worried as to whether or not the climate in terms of the general educators is right for this push. I think that not only the local districts but also administrators, colleges, and university personnel have to ask 'are the regular teachers prepared so that they can really know how to even identify a handicapped child' and how to work with him."

"What kind of an imposition do we, in fact, place on the regular teacher when we say she ought to be able to handle certain kinds of handicapped children in her classroom with the help of resource teachers and aides. I believe we've got to look at inservice training for the regular teacher. I'm afraid we're going to give her a lot of help that she's not prepared to use because she, herself, has not the background."

"In the past, training programs have not made students aware of the problems or concerns that they will face in trying to work with all kinds of children regardless of what their difficulties are."

"We're going to have to do a better job of preservice and inservice with teachers in working with kids with problems. Part of it goes beyond just the straight inservice training. I hate to use the word *sensitivity* because that's not really what I mean, but inservice in terms of a better understanding of kids and how teachers, themselves, feel about kids would help regular teachers do a better job with all kids that have some kind of problem."

"In training, I think it would be well if the regular classroom teachers could have some of the basic courses dealing with handicapped children so that they could have a better understanding and do a better job of identifying or working with them in the class. As for the actual classroom instruction, we feel that it is better for them to remain in the regular class whenever possible with resource room or itinerant teacher to offer specialized help."

"There has been a big adjustment for teachers to make. It is going to be a bigger one for principals to accept. Now these youngsters are not going to be in a self-contained classroom. They will be working parttime with their resource teacher in a small group and feeding out to many areas of the school where once upon a time they could never tread. This is going to be a big problem."

Similar concerns are voiced by local administrators.

"The greatest challenge definitely is to provide regular classroom teachers with enough information, enough resources, and sufficient personnel to take care of some of our mildly handicapped boys and girls in the regular classroom. We find that certain regular classroom teachers can do this and do it all the time, but the great majority of teachers do not have the training or the materials."

"The typical teacher who comes into education has very little or no training in special education or exceptional children unless they have elected to take it on their own. I think this kind of thing needs to be geared into teaching curriculum in our teacher training institutions across the country. I think this is a serious shortcoming."

Not all administrators feel it is feasible to mainstream all of their children.

"I don't think that we will ever totally do away with self-contained classrooms. Obviously, the resource room approach will help us with our transitional kinds of cases such as upper educables, perhaps mild LD, and almost certainly with the socially maladjusted and the transitory ED child."

"Our whole model today is based on the assumption that out of the 5 percent that we say need intervention, only 2 percent will need to be removed from the regular classroom. We're saying that half the learning disabled children can be served with varying degrees of support and service within the regular classroom. On the other hand, the multiple handicapped, deaf-blind and crippled child who is often developmentally disabled and learning disabled is going to spend less time in the regular classroom than he has in the past."

Motivating the regular teacher to accept the special child may also be a problem.

"How do you do a good job of integrating into the regular school program a child who is handicapped in his academic skills and yet has a serious need for companionship and friendship among the regular kids in the school? We phase our kids out of our special education rooms into regular programs as much as we can but if we knew more about how to convince people it ought to be done, and make teachers more accepting of the child who she sees as another load added to her already overloaded group of responsibilities, maybe we could do a better job for the handicapped."

"The attitude of the regular teacher is of key importance. The principal of the school is the best administrative tool we have to reach out to Mrs. Smith in the 3rd grade or Mr. Jones in the 8th grade to be sensitive toward children in their classes who are not doing well. The need is to sensitize the teacher to be more perceptive in various areas. We believe regular teachers try. But the administrative implication is, what is in it for them except more work. Do you compensate the regular teacher because she has several identified handicapped children in her class and she is putting forth the effort to program for them? Or do we give her help. I think the delivery system will need considerable administrative implementation as to what service patterns can and should be offered. The teachers aren't in a position to cause this to happen. The principals are. We must interface our special educators more formally with the school principal."

"The best way to bring about the involvement of those aspects in the school outside of special education with special education is through the principal's office. Another way to bring about involvement is to provide some sort of incentive for the involvement. I don't mean monetary incentive, but if we want to have a teacher of nonhandicapped children become more involved with programs for the handicapped, we must help her by providing such incentives, possibly, as teacher aides for her, or limiting her enrollment. It's very hard for the teacher of the nonhandicapped child with a class enrollment of 35 or 40 kids to be asked to become involved with a handicapped child that may require some individual instruction without giving her some kind of help. Another way is through the introduction of inserv-

ice training courses within the schools involving the classroom teacher and by providing subsidies for the regular teacher to take courses in special education. The resource room program does involve a regular classroom teacher, but, for her to be involved in the resource room program requires the support and willingness of the principal to make certain accommodations in the program. We have to recognize, if one is to ask for help, one has to also supply the necessary resources or accommodations that make it possible to achieve this kind of integration."

Many states have already begun the task of integrating their children. Although some still have concerns, others are confident that the concept can work.

"We have a three phase learning disability program. We have the lab which is comparable to the self-contained learning disability classroom except that these boys and girls do move into regular activities usually like music and physical education as in any program. The second phase has a resource teacher who works directly with the exceptional child for some part of the day and then plans his daily activities with the regular classroom teacher for the rest of the day. This child is assigned to a regular homeroom. The third phase is for the child that's been moved to this school because he was having difficulty in the classroom but he has not been assigned to a learning disabilities resource person. The resource teacher goes over his work and makes plans for this child with the regular classroom teacher. For all practical purposes in terms of teacher supervision, he has only that regular classroom teacher, her aides, or her student teacher working with him. But the resource teacher is helping to work out his program. Usually, the children are not placed in one or the other phases on the basis of achievement but rather on behavior, their ability to work in the group situation. In other words, they may be 3 years below grade level and still be in the regular classroom program because we find that they can function in there and they can perform if they are given the right kinds of things to do."

"Some projects evaluate all the children, not just special children, in the first grade. They have an open classroom situation and a resource teacher working to meet the needs of what would normally be classified as exceptional children. But the nice thing about the program is that no children are labeled 'exceptional' and if you view the classroom situation, you cannot really pick out the exceptional children."

"We put all the supposedly intermediate retarded kids into the regular program. They come to the EMR teacher for help. It is called intensive study, and the room becomes the intensive study room. The EMR teacher works with the regular teacher. The children have a regular grade homeroom and they go into their homeroom each semester and are identified with their homeroom. Where they need help in their academic studies, they come to the intensive study teacher. We keep our figures on them as being retarded because the intensive study teacher has to do this for state funds and so forth, but they are actually assimilated into the regular program."

"Our approach has been to have specifically trained personnel to deal with the particular problems of a handicapped child. Then we use that person as a resource person and coordinator to work with each child and as soon as possible gear him into a regular program. It might be that they would go with regular children for only one class period a day, gradually working up to 2 or 3 hours, and ultimately full time. This approach is used with every single one of our programs regardless of the handicap."

"Our special education students are in no way track students. Our special education program is not a track program. There is great mobility and great flexibility both to phase a student in or out. It is totally dependent on the needs that each individual student manifests at any given point in time."

"There are any number of youngsters in regular classes that, when it comes to a categorical structure like we have, they don't quite meet the criteria for special education and yet it's fairly obvious to many people that they do have educational problems. If we leave them there for a year or 2 years, we can rest assured that they are going to qualify for entrance to a self-contained class. Why not get them early when they can still make it in the mainstream. All we have to do is bring in some backup supportive services in many, many cases and they will not become candidates for self-contained classes."

In California, court cases and legislation during the past few years created a need to reevaluate all EMR students and phase them back into regular classes if their IQ fell within two standard deviations below the mean.

"Transition programs were developed to help smooth out this abrupt change from the special education environment to the general education environment. School systems have been given free leeway to develop whatever kind of additional services are needed to smooth this transition."

"In one area an itinerant teacher program for the EMRs attempted to serve junior high level pupils in regular classrooms rather than by special classes. They had 15 children in this, five of which after one year were integrated back into the regular program and did very well. Five made a good integration back after they had been served awhile in the itinerant teacher pro-

gram. There were five who couldn't make it at all and had to go back to the special class program."

"At the junior high level we have another EMR resource program in a school that has completely modified its curriculum through a Title III ESEA project which is for individualized instruction. This whole junior high is set up in subject matter areas and our boys and girls in the resource program have a special education teacher who works with them. He plans all day programs for these kids with the regular classroom teachers."

"Another itinerant teacher program serves elementary school children in their regular classroom. They have an educational manager, essentially an MR teacher, but a person whose responsibility is to put together individual programs for each of these children. A great number of classroom volunteers are used; in some cases, they are practicing teachers or college students, and in some cases they are high school students, and even sixth grade students who assisted the individual pupils for partial support and tutorial assistance."

"In senior high we do not have a special education teacher hired. We have identified the students as special need students that have some type of handicap that impaired their learning. It might be a physical handicap or an economic handicap. We have classes in the evening in math, social studies, etc., in which we work with these people individually and try to meet their needs; then we place them with other students in vocational and specialized classes."

"By working together one entire educational community changed their attitude about special education. A multi phase approach was used in working with school systems. Phase one involved the total educational community including principals, supervisory central office staff, as well as general education teachers. Phase two consisted of developing the immediate situation, and determining what they already had; that included a survey, which cut across not only children but also program lines, physical space, etc. Phase three involved a series of meetings by areas of exceptionality. The committees were controlled by general education teachers as well as building principals. No plan could have been successful without having involved every individual within the school system."

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Problems associated with accountability were of concern to approximately 23 state administrators and at least 12 local directors of special education. The national trend toward budgeting accounting systems in education has created a new awareness as well as a new pressure to account for the effectiveness of money spent. Some states are in the process of defining what needs to be known and a few are gathering data on the effectiveness of delivery systems, programs, and student performance. Accountability starts with asking the right questions. One of the main reasons accountability in education is having problems is that

"We don't seem to have a handle on what kinds of questions we ought to be asking schools as to what really is happening down there with children. We've got to figure out what the questions are in order for school systems to clearly and concretely show that a program is worthwhile."

"With limited resources and infinite needs, one has to constantly appraise whether the program he's putting money in is doing any good or whether there are more high priority needs where these funds should be channeled."

"We need to get some hard data on the value of some of the systems that we have been utilizing. We just skip around too easily condemning special classes, pushing itinerant programs, and telling how wonderful resource rooms are and what they can do with practically no hard data whatever. I don't think we've done an adequate job of really assessing the program for the kid, if it's of any value and how we can identify the value. We are basing our reactions on very limited research. Nobody seems to be taking a hard look at whether these systems are of any value and to whom."

"In fact, I would say generally there's very little research that we can look upon and call upon when we're going before legislators to say that one way of handling special education programs is better than another. That it's really necessary to spend $5,000 a year to educate a deaf child and yet it only costs $1,500 a year to educate a retarded child. Some of the cliches in our profession about what's special about special education, we had a pretty hard time answering when we were put before a legislative body. It brings up the whole question in terms of research in teacher training. What really is needed? What does a teacher really need to know? What kind of a person do we really need to have? They are very fundamental questions that haven't ever, to our knowledge, been answered. For example, is it really necessary to train very finely tuned specialists? Is there a real difference between a trained teacher of the retarded and a trained teacher of the learning disabled? Or if you train a teacher in one field, is there really an operational difference in how he functions with children?"

"A research project at one university with the educable mentally

retarded investigates how the teacher perceives the children in her class, the problems individual differences create for the teacher, and her reaction to children during academic instruction. We also have an evaluation of what happens to the regular classroom teacher when you take the special child out of her class, and what effect this has on the other pupils in the class. Does it make her a better teacher? Does it make better students? Does better instruction take place? We are also following the child taken out, as to what happens to him as opposed to what happened to him in the regular classroom."

Several administrators felt that there is a basic problem in communication, sophistication, and identification of accountability dimensions.

"Somewhere along the line there's going to have to be some getting together on this whole business of the way you determine what your needs really are. When you start to try to compare incidence figures which come from one part of the country with figures from another part of the country, you are really talking about two totally different groups of people and therefore have no real basis for comparison. In other words, we have to get our basic assumptions, basic definitions, and our basic methods of identifying children who need help coordinated across the country before we're really going to have any way of knowing just exactly what's going on. We need to move to a more national idea of what we're really talking about in terms of handicapped children."

"Many of our local counties, and even we here at the state, are not sophisticated enough in terms of research techniques and methods to develop comprehensive research components for evaluation of program effectiveness."

"I think that we need to rethink, clarify, and differentiate between systems objectives, which are objectives for delivery systems, program objectives, which are for programs for handicapped kids and behavioral objectives, which are teacher related and student related behaviors in the classroom. The literature to this point has failed to make this very important differentiation and most people, unless they have been able to make this themselves, have been floundering around trying to make these three systems somehow fit together without recognizing that they're somehow different. They're all designed to do the same thing, but you have to deal with them as separate entities, and I'm more and more impressed with the evidence that people are lost in the maze of these three different levels of systems and these three different ways of thinking about programs. I guess maybe if someone could write an article which could clearly delineate and talk in practical terms about the problem of managing a system as opposed to the problem of operating a program as opposed to the problem of achieving behavioral objectives for kids, and not think that a management system is going to achieve behavioral objectives, that an awful lot of special educators would be helped. This differentiation gives a frame of reference upon which one can make almost instant management decisions."

"The teachers are now more alert to the fact that there has to be some accountability and some measurement of progress by the children. We have rewritten a good deal of the curriculum so that it can be put in measurable terms for the behavioral objectives."

"We see a real need to be able to break down the entering behaviors that a child exhibits into very observable and measurable units, thereby allowing us to program from that point. This approach will enable us to verify the results that we claim we are able to produce."

"Teachers need to have the skills to pinpoint, measure on a semicontinuous basis the child's performance over a period of time, and be able to explore those changes in the child's environment which effect either the rate of learning or the type of behavior that the child's exhibiting. This is the single, most effective way of looking at the kid in terms of his performance. When we say this, we're sort of denying the use of a lot of achievement types of tests, a lot of individual IQ tests, and a lot of psychometrics which have, in the past, been considered effective in identifying kids with problems."

"Attempts are being made to develop teaching as a strategy, using a systems approach in developing model programs for handicapped children. This model, basically, is being used with the EMR group first and the attempt is being made to develop pupil and program goals, behaviorally based objectives and procedures, building in dollar cost of programs and building in expectations in anticipated related pupil performance levels. This is a Title VI project, and the County Superintendent of Schools has contracted out a management consultant specialist to work with the staff in trying to systematize their program of developing their goals and their objectives which are truly reachable and measurable."

Some states have begun to compare the relative effectiveness of different programs and diagnostic techniques.

"One Title III program is attempting to take a look at several different approaches to learning disabilities; for example, they are doing a complete Frostig Program with one particular group, moving with the Gillingham Program with another, Fernald with a third, IPI with a fourth; a fifth group will serve as controls. Results will be

compared over a three year period."

"Title VI money was used to hire a private company called Teaching Research to study six different programs in the state to see how effective they are. They are using a computer to keep track of the types of instruments used in diagnosis, treatment, and achievement."

"In one large city a teacher questionnaire identified 2,700 students with educational or behavioral problems. Of those, 200 were selected randomly for a full diagnostic evaluation. We found that the teacher questionnaire, as gross as it was, was 80 percent effective. I think if we perfect questionnaires for teachers just a bit, we'd save thousands and millions of dollars in identification. A teacher knows when a child is having trouble. And she has some broad notions as to why. Starting from there, we can certainly move rapidly in bringing specialists to determine educational needs of the child. Psychologists in clinical psychology and educational psychology still aren't facing children educationally. We're getting descriptions of children, but the psychologists are still unable to sufficiently program on their description. We're going to have to prepare teachers to program better or retrain psychologists to properly reflect implications for instruction."

"We have a program using a staff of four teachers to serve about 60 kids who are educationally handicapped at the elementary school level. One teacher is a diagnostician. She figures out what the child needs. The second one takes the diagnosis and puts this into a prescription—gets the materials ready and so forth. The third teacher is an implementer—actually takes the children and implements a program. The fourth one is an evaluator—takes what's been done, sees how successfully it's being conducted and the results it's getting with the child. Then this is channeled back through the first diagnostician. It's a team approach. We've had very phenomenal success with it."

In the final analysis, accountability is the measurable, observable behavior of the learner. The success of the program depends on the success of each child not only in specific academic areas but in his total adjustment.

"For example, we're really asking what becomes of pupils who've had learning disability service under special education and how have they adapted after they've been in this and back into the regular program."

"In a post high school followup study in cooperation with a university research and training center in mental retardation, we're trying to develop a clear cut questionnaire which can be used by teachers on post high school graduates of the EMR program. We want to get feedback on the EMR curriculum as well as some accountability for pupils that have been in the program the year after they've graduated. The questionnaire will be organized under 8 to 10 major goals with an attempt to see to what extent we can find behavioral evidence of one kind or another that these goals have been achieved."

PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

In spite of the supposed surplus of trained educators in the country today, finding effective competent staff was cited as the most difficult problem currently facing administrators. With the growth of federal and state supported programs, and the mandates for broader coverage and accountability, local directors are especially hard pressed to find teachers and supervisory personnel to do the job. The administrators told of their biggest problems and how they were dealing with them.

"Retraining of the personnel in the field of special education is one of the greatest challenges. Change comes very slowly and very laboriously and we find that many of the teachers are not enthusiastic about learning the new methodologies and the new measurement techniques that we feel modern special education requires. We have to find ways to help them want to increase their knowledge in the area of behavioral management and management by objectives."

"The largest problem that we have is educating our general school administrators and teachers as to what is special education; what is a good special education program; what competencies are required of the people in special education; and how to go about securing special education services."

"I am deeply impressed with the effort of the Texas Education Agency in their Plan A to charge local school districts—local schools within school districts—to provide service to every handicapped child. They, in effect, say to the principal, serve every child you think needs help. The Texas Education Agency has served handicapped children on two plans. Plan A and Plan B. Plan B is the typical special education we've known for a decade. Plan A gives money to a local school to offer the proper education that each child in that school needs. They'll probably find they're serving something like 40 percent rather than 13 percent, but it will give us some insights as to how to have a division of labor between general and special education in the large gray area."

Many states are watching Texas' Plan A to see how local districts

will meet the needs of their handicapped. Eleven states indicated an interest in Plan A as a model.

"One Texas local administrator finds that one of the most difficult challenges in the area of teacher certification and inservice training is to orient the principals and regular classroom teachers into the actual foundation for the new Plan A."

Progress in teacher training depends on communication and cooperation.

"A training institution, a school system, a university, and a state department more or less all have to be on the same wave lengths in order to make an impact in the state; not that you can't have different models, but you've got to have basic commitments to work together and that's the hardest thing of all."

"We generally find the universities are behind the needs of the field both in quality and in quantity."

"I think the college preparation program has to be changed. I don't care how good a program these teachers come out of, it always appears to me that it smacks of a watered-down program of the regular curriculum. What is so special about special education that kids don't get in other places? How do we facilitate learning more effectively for handicapped children?"

"We feel that we cannot train people in the college classroom. It is more important for them to be out in the field and working with people in the field than getting theoretical kinds of approaches that one might get in the college. We're not saying colleges don't have a place, but that there has to be more of a mesh between the practicum experiential kind of thing and the theoretical thing that one gets in college."

"One district feels the real dire problem is the education of the teachers. The training that they are getting now does not fit the needs as I see it, therefore I would say that in teacher training there have to be changes. I don't feel that teachers understand how learning takes place, and I feel that this would apply to teachers of any kind, no matter what kind of instruction they would be giving."

"The skills which our training programs are equipping our outcoming professionals with and the needs that are present in the field don't match up too well. An example would be our school psychologists are graduating with masters degrees and absolutely no competency in the area, or perhaps even any exposure to the area of curriculum. Yet the first crack out of the box, they are asked, and I feel legitimately asked, by a classroom teacher, to suggest curriculum modifications or changes that might help her to better educate a child."

Everyone recognizes the need to define or describe the competencies needed to work successfully with children. Many feel that a more broad based education is necessary.

"A pattern of competency, maybe in something called general special education should include some management techniques, basic skills techniques, child development and combined areas in which teachers in special education would take preparation as a base for the general special education certificate."

"We're very much concerned that services are slow in getting to the isolated school districts. Often they are delivered through a one-dimensionally trained teacher or a one-category trained teacher such as a teacher for the mentally retarded. But there are other children that need services. They are not in sufficient prevalence that the district can employ one teacher for two kids and this sort of thing, so we have endeavored to design a new program in which the special education person that goes into the small district would be trained in emotional disturbance, mental retardation, learning disabilities, behavior modification, some assessment techniques, and have some familiarity with good counseling skills."

When states move to a competency based program, old certification standards have to be changed.

"No longer will anyone be certified for life in this state, and every person within a period of 5 years must take a minimum amount of training that will increase their competency. In other words, training that would be related to the area in which they are teaching. We will be requiring as of 1973, every single supervisory union or consortium of supervisory unions to submit plans for teacher education—their own education of the teachers within their union to meet their need to get additional training and to improve the competency of their teachers. We think this is going to promote less emphasis on getting college courses and more emphasis on getting training—whether it's college courses or otherwise that relate to that particular teacher's functioning in the classroom. We have a state plan that outlines classes and specific areas of competency the teacher has to take the training in."

"One of the things we're doing is to develop new certification standards for the state based upon actual in the field teaching performance, rather than upon college credit or degrees earned. In effect, a teacher will be judged on how well she does in school, that is, how well she does in the public school with kids rather than on how well she does in a college setting in her training program. We will work this up to provide continuous inservice training for the teachers. The obvious implication here is that the

most effective teachers will continue to teach whether or not they have a degree or whether or not they have taken specified courses in a college curriculum. This is general, not just in special education, but extended across the state. We do have committees working on performance standards for teachers in all areas of the handicapped as well as school psychologists, therapists, school nurses, etc."

"The state department of education actually helps approve programs with the colleges and universities and does this on the basis of identifying competencies that the people in the university or state college will need to be able to address themselves to. We are very hopeful that we can move towards competency models. There is some beginning evidence that we can do this, but it does seem to be very difficult to move away from the course work model, although this is somewhat more easily achieved in terms of the way the state department looks at it than the way the colleges are looking at it."

In the past there has been very little opportunity prior to student teaching for a person to explore how well suited he may be for the teaching profession. Since student teaching is traditionally scheduled during the senior year in college, it is rather late to find out that you made a mistake. Some efforts are being made to alter this condition.

"For the first time this year we have started a student tutoring program at one of our high schools. We have selected a group of high school seniors who are college bound to come into our special education classes for the EMH kids one period a day, five periods a week to work on a one to one ratio with our special education students in the area of reading or math or specific subject areas. This is directly under the supervision of certified teachers. We've also permitted these kids to just kind of rap informally with our special education kids that have some problems. We've gotten very interesting results on this program, and we have found that this pure relationship with our special education students has been very helpful to them. In connection with this program we have organized a college class that has in its composition all the various disciplines related to special education—counseling, guidance, teaching, social work, even medicine. The student tutors have the opportunity to take this college class which is offered on Saturday morning for which they receive college credit. We attempt to expose them to all disciplines that are either directly or indirectly related to special education with the hopes of having some of these outstanding bright young people either select a career in special education or at least be exposed to all facets of special education."

"Centers are being developed in one state that will carry inservice, preservice, and postservice formal course work. It will be worked through and around all the present college and university training programs as well as state department personnel. The emphasis will be on trying to close the gap between what looks to be a teacher when they go into the classroom and what actually is a teacher. We're hoping that we're going to decentralize as much as we can the present on campus thrust for training and hopefully change the licensure model to some extent. It breaks down the certification, but hopefully we will be training general special educators and developing a core curriculum."

The use of video tapes for inservice training is gaining in popularity.

"We have a TV program in the schools and are hopefully putting in a program just for methods dealing with special pupils."

"We're also in the midst of developing a 15 tape television series. The focus of this tape series will be on learning problem kids. We hope to offer this 15 tape series not only on instructional television but also as course work at various colleges and universities throughout our state so that teachers can be watching the tapes and using the tapes as a basis for taking course work in special education. We also have a major research and evaluative component in this instructional television series to determine the effectiveness of television as a media for training of teachers in special education."

A number of models are being explored for large scale inservice training.

"One of these models is called the Dissemination Change Agent Model. Basically they pick a content area and five teams go to the Instructional Materials Center. Each team consists of a teacher, a special education teacher, a special education administrator, and a psychologist. These teams were trained at a five day conference. The content of one of the sessions was Contingency Contracting. These teams then came back to their home state, implemented the concept in the teacher's classroom for 16 days. That was the original commitment. They then trained five teachers in the district, who again were committed to implement for 16 days. However, all six teachers implemented to the end of the year. And now, this is being done on the state level where the team that was selected is now selecting five teams who will come to a conference and be trained and then will go back to each of their individual districts and train five more teachers."

There is a growing recognition for the need to train local people to meet local needs. Very often specialists who are brought in do not stay. Administrators see that the

success of a program depends on the involvement of the professionals who are permanent residents of an area.

"We're concerned that the special fellowship program has not been doing the job as we think it needs to be done, so we completely redesigned that program. There is now a six phase program for the training of all personnel working with handicapped youngsters. The six phases look something like a pyramid. At the base of the pyramid we have basic orientation efforts for large groups. The second phase gets into a special study institute and is more selective; it takes in personnel from the specific region which we are targeting in on at a given time. The personnel are selected very carefully to participate in this phase which provides more information in greater depth over a 7 week summer institute period. Here's where the program is different: the people selected must represent a need of a district, and thus in a sense, a district applies for the training. A district makes an application through this individual that they send to the institute for the improvement of their local programs. The district representatives attend in teams. The team will vary from one district to the next, depending upon its sophistication, needs, etc. But we are tired of seeing individual teachers coming into these programs and going back as loners, with programs they cannot implement. We want the superintendent, a counselor, a special educator, and good regular classroom teachers. During the third phase the team implements the plan using department personnel as resource persons. The fourth phase involves leadership training. We will provide a traineeship for two years. During the fifth phase they continue to implement. The sixth phase provides an internship with the state department and the university. We're increasingly selective about the people we train. We've got to target in on the programs which need help."

Some state departments are working closely with teacher training institutions to develop the kind of programs relevant to their particular needs.

"We have a project dealing with learning disabilities children. This is conducted right at the heart of the Ozarks. It's fairly isolated and it was just impossible to find the kind of supervisory personnel that we'd wanted for the project, so we entered into a contract with the medical center, which is taking a complete inservice training project to the regular teachers to alert them as to what to look for in learning disabilities."

"The University of Arizona has been given a block grant and they have zeroed in on a single county. They are planning massive inservice through the university in that county. Rather than dividing their fellowships and traineeships up at the university, they are bringing the faculty to the county."

"Our state is planning a series of meetings with the colleges and universities. What we hope will occur is a complete revamping of what we can call teacher education. We hope that we may have something that looks like a core curriculum that would let us have a teacher that might be able to handle LD, ED or upper educables. We really hope for the development of a core kind of curriculum that will give us an educator whose training will be based on competencies and not on how many courses a person has had."

"A professor from one college is turning an entire school into a kind of living-training center for teachers by working with not only the special teachers, but the regular classroom teachers in terms of diagnosing and prescribing for kids. She's using three fellowship students as kind of master teachers who are working directly with the classroom teachers in terms of helping to implement this diagnostic, prescriptive kind of framework. They're utilizing an inner city school. The fact that they're working with the entire school rather than working only with special education is a change. I think that is what's necessary in order for special education to work within a school. To have all the people involved in terms of the whole educational process and not just special education as an isolated little piece sitting up on a pedestal somewhere; it's an integral part of the whole school operation."

THE EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED AND LEARNING DISABLED

The telephone interviewer asked directors specifically to name an area which they felt was particularly difficult to provide for. Thirty-five state directors indicated that additional alternatives for emotionally disturbed children needed to be developed. Fourteen of the local directors also indicated difficulty in programing for emotionally disturbed youngsters. Almost half of the state directors named learning disabilities as a second problem area.

The main problems in programing seem to be in the diagnosis of the disturbance and the training of personnel. Some of the responses of the state directors point up the general concerns in the area.

"I cannot help but feel that in our programs for the disturbed at the present time we are taking a lot of children that functionally are not a disturbance problem but ones in need of behavior modification, and I shudder at the things we're

doing in tagging children. I can't help but believe that if more work, more research were done in the behavior modification area, we might eliminate about 90 percent of our so called disturbed children."

Directors from eight states were impressed by the engineered classroom concept. There is a growing awareness of the positive effects of behavior modification for dealing with children with behavioral problems. Some felt that not enough alternatives existed for children with emotional problems.

"A national committee and a state committee is needed to structure multiple resources for emotionally disturbed children, because home instruction programs, public school programs, private day schools and private residential schools limit our ability to place children appropriately. The wide spectrum or span of emotional disturbances indicates strongly a need for a wider spectrum of resources."

In many areas the education of emotionally disturbed children has been handled almost exclusively by private schools. To assess the effectiveness of private education,

"One state is obtaining information from the parents of children who have gone into private schools for the emotionally disturbed, and have left those schools, over the period beginning in 1962. This involves 700 children who went into private schools, day or residential. The data is being collected from two standpoints; number one, how has the person made out, academically and therapeutically, as a result of the experience; and number two, how valid is this investment of public monies."

In many areas the emotionally disturbed are grouped with the neurologically handicapped, the educationally handicapped, or the learning disabled children. One state director capsulizes the problem in the comment, "We don't know which one of the 168 definitions to use."

"We have school districts that claim that 65 percent of their youngsters have learning disorders. My question is, should we take over the whole school system under special education then?"

Specific programs which state and local directors consider effective have been selected and reflect the variety of options available for children with behavioral problems.

"One of the best things that ever happened was the development of Teacher Mom programs for disturbed children. We are dealing with basically 5, 6, and 7 year old emotionally disturbed kids and we have a master teacher. The direct service to the kids is carried out through the volunteers in the community. We have some women who have been donating two mornings a week for 6 years who work with kids on an individual basis. This, of course, allows us to provide a one to one relationship with kids."

"One really outstanding program is a camp for emotionally disturbed boys. These boys have either been expelled from school or completely excluded from the school situation. There will be camping and cooking. The counselor will help shape the boys' behavior and act as an intervener and a behavior modifier. This will be better done because of the change in environment. The boys will stay at the camp initially for a year, and then hopefully the camp is going to try to feed them back into the appropriate setting within the home community."

"One of the programs cited has received the President's National Award for a Title III project for behavior modification in assisting teaching for the emotionally disturbed. They used the engineered classroom approach. They kept very accurate records of their data on special self-contained placement and progress in the regular classroom. It was very successful because of the spinoff; the regular classroom teachers began to see this accurate data in terms of achievement in children. We think that it was helpful to move us along the line, not only in our self-contained classroom, not only in all areas of exceptional children, but in the regular classroom we are able to begin to help prepare teachers to individualize better."

"Another special project involving seriously emotionally disturbed children ages 4 through 14 is designed to keep the children, in the community, and in school, as far as possible. There's been a great deal of emphasis put on the training of volunteers and paraprofessionals who are assigned specific tasks and are actually working with primitive children. I suppose that this probably would be the most unique factor because as you well know, most of the formal philosophy in working with the emotionally disturbed is that heavy clinical orientation is needed. But we're having success in getting communication from kids that previously didn't communicate at all."

"Residential classes were established for educationally handicapped children living in three 24 hour foster homes. The district has been able to establish educationally handicapped classes on the campus of all three of these homes because of public school and institutional cooperation. The homes are providing the things the district can't afford including well-equipped classrooms. The district is able to provide the teacher and the instructional aide, or the personnel who are on the payroll through funds that are provided by the state. With this combination they have been

able to establish four new educationally handicapped classes right on the campus of these institutions. The children are in the category of neglected or delinquent, and so most of them have serious personal problems before they are even assigned to these homes. Not many of them fit into a regular campus classroom. It's a unique combination of public and private funding."

"There are some adolescents for whom junior high school placement is too much and they just blow up. They won't do their work. They are insolent and insubordinate to their teachers. We have two classes in a brand new Boys' Club that has a swimming pool, a gymnasium, and a shop. It has a regular beautician's unit for the girls. It is not a school setting, which these kids, for the time being don't want. They are fed up with the formal school. We have regular teachers there. The classes are very small. At the end of the school year close to 60 percent were able to return to regular school."

"A program is being established for severely emotionally disturbed junior high age youngsters who have been removed from public school because their behavior was so inappropriate that it was intolerable. They have an interventionist who has been training teachers at the university in individualizing instruction, and continuous measurement techniques and precision teaching. They also will have two special education teachers, one male and one female and two teaching assistants. These children will be brought in daily for any amount of time that they are able to manage. Some can't manage very much to begin with. Individual contracts will be set up with each of these children. It will have to do with their academic behavior as well as their social behavior. A team will interview and study each child and draw up a contract with him that is appropriate to his entering behavior that he can agree to and the team can agree to. Then they'll work together in trying to bring about some permanent changes in his ability to control his behavior."

"A Title III project for high school youngsters involves an interdisciplinary approach. Primarily all kinds of kids that we list as educationally handicapped are eligible. Most of them have learning problems and have become totally disenchanted with school at the high school level. Some of them have been dropouts and have been brought back in through this special curriculum and approach. They've gotten many of these kids back in and these kids just rave about the program. You go out and talk with them. They didn't ever think school could be like this. They really have a commitment to getting educated again."

Some of the universities and regional centers offer a combination diagnostic service and teacher training component.

"Indiana University has a learning disabilities center in connection with the medical center. Parents accompany their children to the center, and have an educational program and experience along with the child. Out of this is coming quite a complete diagnostic workup, and it also provides teacher training in which the teacher is able to be present and work along with the others on the prescription for the child."

"California provides two diagnostic schools for the neurologically handicapped. One of these services is in northern California and one serves southern California. These schools bring in children from public schools who have very serious problems of neurological causation where they really haven't been able to figure out how to deal with the youngster. These children are brought into a central place which is a school setting and go through the diagnostic teaching process, which in itself is not particularly new or innovative, but this year we're involved in a followup study. What we try to do is get these kids ready to go back into their own public school program, whether it's special education or general education, and we'll move back out with the child to his local school district in a followup kind of program to work with the child's teacher in his home school district to follow through on the diagnostic teaching processes which may have been rather laboriously developed over a period of time. This phases the child back in, and it trains the child's regular class teacher in the diagnostic, prescriptive kind of approach to deal with the youngster. We think this may have a spreading ripple effect to help the teacher deal with all the children she might have."

"This year for the first time, in cooperation with our state health department, we have assigned to the neurology clinics and their consultation and evaluation clinics an education specialist. The purpose of this is to provide some educational input not only for diagnosis but for prescriptions in terms of how best to work with the youngsters that the clinics see. These educational specialists will actually follow the child back to his home school, his home community, and sit down with his teacher, his principal, etc., and try to implement the educational program for him."

Administrators from State Departments of Special Education

Alabama. CLINTON R. OWENS

Alaska. JOHN ANTTONEN

Arizona. JOSEPH PASANELLA and KAREN DAVIS

Arkansas. TOM J. HICKS

California. LESLIE BRINEGAR

Colorado. JOHN OGDEN

Connecticut. FRANCIS A. MCELANEY and JOE GORDON

Delaware. ROBERT C. HAWKINS and EDWARD DILLON

District of Columbia. DOROTHY HOBBS

Florida. LANDIS M. STETLER

Georgia. HERBERT D. NASH

Hawaii. HATSUKO F. KAWAHARA

Idaho. JOHN F. COMBA

Illinois. DAVID W. DONALD

Indiana. GILBERT A. BLITON

Iowa. RICHARD E. FISCHER

Kansas. JAMES E. MARSHALL

Kentucky. STELLA A. EDWARDS

Louisiana. FAYE MCCORMICK and MR. WRIGHT

Maine. BEVERLY TRENHOLM and JOSEPH W. KERN

Maryland. STANLEY MOPSIK

Massachusetts. WILLIAM PHILBRICK, JR.

Michigan. MARVIN E. BEEKMAN

Minnesota. JOHN C. GROOS

Mississippi. HERMAN K. WHITE

Missouri. DONALD M. COX and JOHN PATTERSON

Montana. JACK RUDIO

Nebraska. JOHN B. LAMPHERE

Nevada. LARRY DAVIS

New Hampshire. MANFRED F. DREWSKI and ROBERT KENNEDY and MR. GILLETTE

New Jersey. DANIEL RINGELHEIM

New Mexico. ELIE S. GUTIERREZ

New York. RAPHAEL F. SIMCHES

North Carolina. THEODORE R. DRAIN and HAL GRIFFIN

North Dakota. JANET M. SMALTZ

Ohio. S. J. BONHAM, JR.

Oklahoma. MAURICE P. WALRAVEN

Oregon. MASON D. MCQUISTION

Pennsylvania. WILLIAM F. OHRTMAN

Rhode Island. FRANCIS B. CONLEY

South Carolina. W. OWENS CORDER

South Dakota. ROBERT HUCKINS

Tennessee. VERNON L. JOHNSON

Texas. DONALD L. PARTRIDGE

Utah. R. ELWOOD PACE

Vermont. JEAN S. GARVIN

Virginia. JAMES T. MICKLEM

Washington. JOHN P. MATTSON

West Virginia. ROGER P. ELSER

Wisconsin. JOHN W. MELCHER

Wyoming. LAMAR GORDON, JR.

Administrators of Special Education in Local Districts

D. ARNOLD, Principal, Akron, Colorado

PEARSON ARRISON, School Psychologist, Corning, New York

FRED BABB, Director of Special Services, Edmonds School District, Lynnwood, Washington

DONALD BANDERHEIDEN, Principal, Central City Schools, Central City, Nebraska

MARY BEAMAN, Coordinator of Special Education, Yuma School District I, Yuma, Arizona

ALLENE BECHTLE, Director of Special Education, School District 19, Springfield, Oregon

RICHARD BELLOU, Director of Special Services, Superior Public Schools Joint District I, Superior, Wisconsin

DONALD BLODGETT, Executive Director of Special Education and Special Programs, Milwaukee Public Schools, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

DON BLOOM, Coordinator of Special Education, Enid, Oklahoma

IRENE CARR, Director of Special Education, Hamtramck City Schools, Hamtramck, Michigan

MARY CLIFFORD, Director of Special Education, Lawrence, Massachusetts

RON COMBS, Director of Special Services, Grand Island Public Schools, Grand Island, Nebraska

BILLYE BOB CURRIE, Director of Special Education, Hattiesburg Municipal Separate School District, Hattiesburg, Mississippi

JAMES DAHLKE, Principal, Central City Schools, Central City, Nebraska

JAMES DAVIS, Principal, Central City Schools, Central City, Nebraska

NEWTON ELLIOTT, Director of Special Education, Alton, Illinois

MARJORY FARRELL, District Coordinator of Special Education, Kansas City, Missouri

C. KENT GARHART, Director of Special Education, Manhatten, Kansas

LYLE GRAYSON, Director of Special Education and Speech Correction, Billings, Montana

CARL J. GROSLAND, Special Education Director, Rudd-Rockford-Marblebrock, Mason City, Iowa

MARK HANSON, Coordinator of Special Education, Newport-Mesa Unified School District, Newport Beach, California

HENRY HAUCK, Supervisor of Special Education, Sioux Falls, South Dakota

RAY HENSON, Superintendent of Schools, Talihina School District, Talihina, Oklahoma

JOAN HODUM, Supervisor of Special Education, Neptune Township, Neptune, New Jersey

V. ISENBERG, Education Diagnostician, Corpus Christi, Texas

SANFORD KALWARA, Supervisor, Special Education, Phoenix Union High School District, Phoenix, Arizona

T. KENEFICK, Assistant Superintendent, Pupil Services, Springfield, Massachusetts

J. KLINGEMAN, Assistant Superintendent, East Central Independent School District, San Antonio, Texas

EDWARD MITROFF, Assistant Superintendent, Avon Lake, Ohio

BEN MORGAN, Director of Special Education, Indianapolis Public Schools, Indianapolis, Indiana

MARGARET MORRISON, Special Education Supervisor, Birmingham, Alabama

ARCHIE S. OLIVER, Jr., Director of Special Education, Alexandria City Schools, Alexandria, Virginia

AILEEN W. PARKER, Director of Special Education, Marion, Illinois

REED PAYNE, Director of Special Education, Corinth Central School, Corinth, New York

MARY CAMELA PENNINGTON, Coordinator of Special Education, Tuscaloosa City Board of Education, Tuscaloosa, Alabama

CAMERON REED, Coordinator of Special Education and Principal, Reedsburg Area Middle School, Reedsburg, Alabama

A. MARY REICHENAUR, Elementary Counselor, East Central Independent School District, San Antonio, Texas

KURT SCHLEICHER, Coordinator of Special Education, Virginia Beach City Schools, Virginia Beach, Virginia

PORTER SCHROFF, School Psychologist, Little Harbor Schools, Portsmouth, New Hampshire

MARVIN SHREVE, Superintendent of Central City Schools, Central City, Nebraska

NOEL SHUTT, Director of Educational Services, Bonita Unified School District, San Dimas, California

CALVIN SNYDER, Director of Special Education, McAllen Independent School, McAllen, Texas

CARL STRINGER, Director of Special Education, Rochester Community School District, Rochester, Michigan

CARL STUART, Superintendent of Schools, Conway Public Schools, Conway, Arkansas

CATHERINE WEBB, Head Educational Diagnostician, Corpus Christi, Texas